

E 449
.M489
Copy 1

A

REVIEW
OF
GARRISONIAN FANATICISM
AND ITS INFLUENCE.

BY MEDICO.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

"Turpi secernis honestum." Hor.

BOSTON:

SOLD BY TICKNOR, REED & FIELDS.

1852.

A

R E V I E W.

O F

GARRISONIAN FANATICISM

AND ITS INFLUENCE.

BY MEDICO.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

"Turpi secernis honestum." Hor.

BOSTON:

SOLD BY TICKNOR, REED & FIE

1852.

E 449
. M 489

REVIEW

Of Rev. J. G. Forman's (Ultra Unitarian "Come-Outer,") Defence of Garrisonianism, Infidelity, etc., and of his Personal Abuse of Individuals.

Ipsi sibi somnia fingunt. Virg.*

MR. FORMAN has published two communications, one of which appeared in the *Nantucket Inquirer* of June 18th, and the other in the *Nantucket Weekly Mirror*, of July 10th, both of which subsequently appeared in the *Liberator*, with commendations by W. L. GARRISON.

Well has it been said by an eminent writer well known to us all, "There is no nonsense so transparent, no crochet so ridiculous, no system so unreasonable, that it cannot find advocates and disciples. The maladies of the body, produced by artificial modes of living, react upon the mind, and infect the reason and sentiments; and many a spurious philosophical system is the product, not of induction, but of dyspepsia; and many a plan of reform, assuming to come from the brain, has its true origin in the bile.

In the pulpit, from the forum, as well as from other positions in society, ranting, croaking and sniveling, coupled with "unamiable insanities," stalk abroad under the pressure of an apron-string philanthropy.

The Rev. New Light Come-Outer under consideration, has succeeded for some time past in disguising his rabidness from the public, under the garb of liberality and philanthropy; not till very lately has it been generally known that he so fully endorsed this last and latest dreg of rabid fanaticism, when in some remarks from his pulpit, June 6th, and in the above communications, he disclosed his sentiments.

We shall better examine these rare specimens of morbid liberality by dividing them into two parts. First—HIS PERSONAL ABUSE. Secondly—HIS DEFENCE OF ULTRAISM, etc. The origin of these pastoral missiles seems to have been a communication signed "A CITIZEN," appearing in the *Inquirer* of June 14th. His abuse is directed to the Editor, also to Medico. The latter, he asserts, without anything better than puerile evidence, is identical

*Their own imaginations they deceive.

with the writer, ["A Citizen."] He proves himself a most valient and prodigious asserter, but makes too much hot haste, to think it worthy his attention to give proof. He first accuses one of a controversial spirit. In this he showed himself a meddler, inasmuch as no one had had any controversy with him up to that time. He accuses others of untruth and "*falsehood*," yet quibbles about it, and attempts to shirk away from the disgrace of such unministerial, ungentlemanly language, by saying, "The word *liar* has not been used by me, as alleged, &c.," "and does not belong to my vocabulary;" as though one could accuse another of falsehood, and dodge the responsibility of such rudeness, by wrapping himself up in a parenthesis. That may do for little, artful dodgers, but the garb is too transparent, too net-like, and the touch of a musquito's bill would rend it asunder. True, such assertions, though pastoral, are no particular credit to one who speaks of himself as an "*untrammelled Minister of the Christian Religion*."

He reproves with bitterness and anger: It has been said, "one may pretend to quiet in the sight of men; he may justify himself even with ingenuous arguments and with many words; but the irritation of his soul consumes him" if angry. It has been the general impression that *He* who went about doing good, reproved calmly, and it carried conviction with it. But it seems evident to all who have read these two anti-parsonic missiles, that this, his "untrammelled" servant, deals in mere assertions, in a spirit of vindictiveness, leading others to be somewhat surprised to see one so easily doff the garb of humility, and show plainly that *revenge* lurks beneath the mild external. (It is said he was once a "limb" of the law.) "Revenge is no valor; but to *bear*, even if wronged, is more christian-like, making one a martyr for truth's sake." Isn't it so? 'Tis always more agreeable to think well of others, and overlook little faults, inasmuch as none are perfect. It makes life seem pleasanter to be charitable; yet when one sees open hypocrisy warring with a conviction of right, they are reminded that

"Notes of sorrow out of tune, are worse
Than priests and fanes that lie.
Seems he a dove? his feathers are but borrowed,
For he's disposed as the hateful raven.
Is he a lamb? his skin is surely lent him,
For he's inclined as are the ravenous wolves."

Preaching and practice always look well together, and if others cannot always combine them, they most naturally expect it of ———.

It has been said that forbearance belonged to the christian graces, and that civility and politeness equally become the preacher as the hearer. But there is evidently some difference of opinion even on this point. Fanatics "come out" even upon these things, and are *liberal in the extreme*. For instance, one has been known to offer, by invitation, their humble services

as a member of a choir, say for nine months more or less, doing it gratuitously and cheerfully; and the minister has been known to assail one in the newspapers as being permitted there by "courtesy," evidently leaving the impression that he was an intruder, because he did not hire a seat. To say the least of such "*untrammeled*" politeness as this, it seems as though one must be hard driven for arguments to defend themselves by *such means*. *Such a minister* labors very hard to carry his points. If we may judge of the magnitude of his points by the "little feebleness" thus generated in the piential gland of this fanatical abolition atmosphere, they would seem to come either under the class of microscopic Termites, or larvae. Such persons seem bound up and circumscribed by their own petty world of self-consciousness, and living mostly with the least of littleness, (themselves,) they are incapable of giving any free and fresh expression to natural thought and emotion. "They hug the phantom of their conceit close to their breasts, and deem it of universal interest and love." And 'tis barely possible, although improbable, that their mawkish foolery finds sympathising listeners. *Others*, however, may still continue their native attachment to forbearance, civility, and good breeding, notwithstanding the scragginess and dowdiness of the Rev. shepherd. Although the shepherd chooses to turn *rabidly black*, yet the native good taste of the flock, will doubtless preserve them from the wooley tinge of such sapient come-outer-ism. It has been said with truth, that, although all are kindly disposed to act, and lend their aid in the cause of humanity, yet their prudence keeps them within bounds; and hence there are very few, if any, of his flock, who are so sable in their "isms" as is the "free and untrammelled," little dodger and ultraist. He stands alone in his aristocracy, puerile democracy, quibbling hypocrisy, and untrammelled civility—his flock and himself, *toto coelo*. Alas! thus we behold this *soi disant*.

His incivility towards the choir is a rare reward for services rendered, however humble; and if one may judge from pre-conceived notions of his "Society," and of the people in general, and of their intelligence and urbanity, 'tis nothing more than justice to say that, so rude, mean, sneaking an act sets with grace only upon an arrogant, presumptuous, rabid Garrisonian Come-Outer. And it would appear that the Rev. sir's name placed to the communications under review, is now fairly enrolled under that fanatical banner. How true it is, then, that one who thus seeks notoriety by "stooping to conquer," is himself a victim to his own *meanness*.

II. *Again*. It appears, by carefully examining these anti-parsonic missiles, that the object in his identifying "A Citizen" is, that he may have some mark for his "dead shot;" not that he might, by *evidence*, *refute* arguments, or do away with objectional inferences of others, but to indulge his penchant for *personal abuse of the author*. Did any one ever know one of these rabid specimens of humanity, who did not seek as earnestly for a

chance of *abusing* others, as he ever sought for the food he eats? They feed and exist upon denunciations. Well may we ask, why did this "untrammelled," in his answer, set aside every spark of dignity, every shadow of argument, and substitute bare-faced assertions and scurrilous abuse? Did he think others would be so very charitable as not to judge him by his fruits? It will not be so with unprejudiced minds, and they are not a few. Should we not most naturally suppose that the reason he took so much offence, was because what was said by "A Citizen," was, to use his own words, "too true"? So he says of those who object to Garrisonian denunciations; and, surely, what's good for the people, must be good for the preacher also. It has been said, that "to beget esteem, we must benefit others." But it seems, indeed, a new invention of ranters, to undertake to "Christianize public sentiment" by calling our neighbors "A Brotherhood of Thieves," and the churches brothels. 'Tis the *offender* that never pardons; hence *they may* look upon this "untrammelled," with charity. Those who act greatly, are truly great,—so says the proverb.

But let us look for a moment at "A Citizen's" communication. It contained a few short sentences attributed to the Rev. Sir in his 6th of June remarks in his pulpit, in defence of rabid Abolitionism, viz., Garrisonian Anti-Slavery advocates "*were sincere*,"—charge of "*infidelity was untrue*,"—he "*respected their holy zeal*." As to their denunciations of the churches, "*may we not ask, do not the churches merit it?*" These, which he does not deny, and knows it will never do, were followed by a few samples of anti-slavery sentiments unpalatable to every sensible person, of course, and he was asked if these were such as he meant others should understand him to endorse? He made no answer direct, but flew off in a tangent, and got awful wrathful. He couldn't keep his temper; and ever since he has acted rather naughty for a minister. To be sure, one cannot always "keep cool" under great emergencies, although it's better to do so "if a body can." What he has since written confirmed all the above quotations. Yet he groans much about mis-quotations from his discourse, but thinks it *not prudent* to specify. He poured out nearly a column of personal abuse upon "A Citizen," and doubtless felt better after being relieved of such stuff. He made more assertions than he could prove in a life-time. *We will, however, leave him and his harmless and uncivil personalities, and pass on to his defence of Garrisonian ultraism.*

It is the opinion of most intelligent and prudent men of this country, of all political parties,—Whig, Democratic and Free Soil,—that these rabid men, by their rashness, and imprudence, and abuse, do much harm, and thus retard the cause of freedom. Hence they are enemies to the slave, and not true philanthropic men in sentiment or action; and *opposition to them is laboring for the good of humanity*. Let us prove this by what follows.

S. S. Foster, a lecturer for the Anti-Slavery Society, said in the Boston

Anniversaries in May, "No one who heard him who should be in the position of a fugitive slave, would hesitate to strike a dagger to the heart of even Mr. Webster, should he carry out the principles he professed, *to pursue the fugitive for the purpose of carrying him back to slavery.*" (See Boston Post, May 27th). "A Citizen" gave the substance of the above, *but it was not marked as a quotation*; yet this "untrammelled" gets in a high furor, and makes the most absurd and monstrous *blunder* of calling it a "sample" of mis-quotation and dishonesty. His anger must have blinded him there, surely. It was either a blunder, or else intentional *for effect*, to mislead the public. But it is to be hoped no one will be so uncharitable towards him, or so rude as to apply one of his favorite expressions to himself, viz., he's been guilty of "*adding dishonesty to falsehood.*" 'Twould scarcely sound well to say such hard things of a minister, although some think *what's good for the people is good for the preacher.* It may be so. Mr. Forman says the part of this quotation italicised is the whole *gist* of Mr. Foster's remark, and that it was making him utter something entirely different, "*not to say horrible,*" to leave them out of "A Citizen's" communication. "A Citizen" did not offer it as a quotation, but as the substance of what Foster said about using daggers. Neither is it given above as the *precise* language of Foster, but as *an outline* by the reporter. Mr. Forman made his reports for the Liberator in the same way, not pretending that they were the precise language of the speaker. It is a common way of reporting the Anniversary proceedings. But let us examine the "*gist*" of Foster's remark. It seems to be a self-evident proposition that the *gist* of it does not, as he asserts, appear to be the latter clause, as italicised, but rather, whether he recommended the fugitive's resorting to violent means of defence. The officer, in executing this law, is called upon to discharge his *official* duty. He is not the law-maker, but the executor. It is a law of the land, and as long as he holds his office he is bound to discharge his duties, however unpleasant to himself. Now should the fugitive carry out Foster's suggestion, he would be *guilty of murder*, and would be hung for it, although he escaped the officer in the first case. He would also destroy his own happiness, if conscious of having murdered any one. Well, then, however offensive this law is in itself, even to Mr. Webster, who opposed it in its present form, yet there is a constitutional obligation resting upon every one as long as the law exists; and if any individual has a right to alter or resist *this* law, then has he the same right to resist and alter every law that does not suit his fancy. No individual has any such right. The *gist*, then, is the using the dagger. So Mr. Forman has missed his point here, and misled others, as he did about the quotation. When Foster councils the slave to resist this law with a dagger, he shows himself to be the very worst enemy the slave has, for he would make him a *murderer*, but not a free man. Mr. Foster is a hired

lecturer, employed by the Anti-Slavery Society to make known their principles. Mr. Forman says in his last, that one of the principles, as published to the world in their creed, is, "Our principles forbid the doing of evil that good may come, and lead us to reject, and to entreat the oppressed to reject, the use of carnal weapons for deliverance from bondage, relying solely on those which are *spiritual* and mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds."

Now Mr. Forman thinks it was making Foster utter a sentiment which was very objectionable, "not to say horrible," to leave out a sentence which did not add to or take from the *gist* of Foster's atrocious villainy in urging the fugitive slave to become a murderer; and he passes over *in silence*, without one word of rebuke, the fact that the *dagger* was to be used, even to be plunged to the heart of an eminent statesman, or any one else who felt it his duty to uphold this law, (not because he was not a friend to, the oppressed), but because he conscientiously discharged a constitutional duty. Mr. Webster is a friend to humanity, and knows better than to overthrow this government for the purpose of freeing the blacks. He feels by so doing it would enslave both whites and blacks in one eternal bondage to anarchy and despotism. The man that talks of "disunion" deserves to be rebuked. But alas! all do not get their deserts; had it been so, the whole squad of these rabid, fanatical, mischief-making Garrisonian Anti-Slavery mad-caps would have been singed in a fiery furnace seven times hotter than that into which Shadrach, Meshech and Abednego were cast. But should one see them there, they would at once help pull them out, and try and do them good "in a quiet way." These fanatics have never as yet cut their wisdom teeth; 'tis to be feared they never will.

II. Foster's creed forbids using carnal weapons. How near has he acted up to it, in recommending a dagger to the fugitive?

Mr. Forman is a *peace* man and a *non-resistant*, yet he has identified himself with Garrison, Foster, Abby Folsom & Co., all of them spitfires and fighters, maligners and disturbers of the peace; and the Rev. Sir deserves to be, *and will be, judged by the company he keeps*. All do not well know how he reconciles his friend Foster's daggerism and his own combativeness in controversies, with non-resistance, or with the principle, love thy neighbor as thyself. Does he consider it a "*spiritual*" method of reforming his brethren, to call them a "brotherhood of thieves?" Wherever the rabid Anti-Slavery speakers have attempted to "reform and christianize public sentiment," (Forman's words), they have outraged the better feelings of all. Bold in speech, saucy, impudent and rude, disregarding all justice to those who disagree with them, quarreling with the churches, calling the clergy a "brotherhood of thieves," their churches brothels, abusing our statesmen, and stirring up strife among the people, they act not unlike monomaniacs, and are such as Shakspeare graphically portrays in "Taming the Shrew:"—

"A mad-cap ruffian,
 That think with oaths to face the matter out.
 I know them, yea,
 And what they weigh, even to the utmost scruple;
 Scrambling, out-facing, fashion-mongering boys,
That lie, and coy, and flout, deprave, and slander,
 Go antiely, and show an outward hideousness,
 And speak off half a dozen dangerous words,
 How they might hurt their enemies if they durst, [with daggers]
 And this is all."

"Snivelers we know there are upon all subjects. They are infesting all classes of society, prattling from the catechism of despair upon reforms of the age. They are sniveling liberalists. They have a babyish, nerveless fear, that cringes to every phantom of apprehension, whining upon exchange, in the business mart, in the pulpit and from the forum. Their very existence seems the embodiment of a whine. They are afflicted with an apron-string philanthropy. Their regret seems to be the natural froth and scum of a whimpering disposition, and the fruits of arrogance. Their speech is the dialect of sorrow, reveling in the rhetoric of regrets and skin-deep lamentations. They mistake the trembling of the nerves, thinking it is the vibration of a chord for humanity. Of all bores, these snivelers are the most intolerable and merciless." They are ranters and braggarts about philanthropy and christian duty. They exercise no corresponding spirit of meekness, but indulge in the most bitter denunciations, often very unjustly, and assail individuals without a cause, and attribute to them all manner of falsehood and untruth unmerited. But all's well that ends well, and Shakspeare has Daguerreotyped them thus:

"Who knows himself a braggart,
 Let him fear this; for it will come to pass
 That every braggart shall be found an ass.
 What cracker is this same, which deafs our ears
 With abundance of *surpurfluous* breath?"

But their word-stilettoes make no great impression upon the minds of intelligent and reflecting people. They wear their daggers *only* in their mouths. They will never knock out others' brains. "Hector shall have a great catch if he knock out either of your brains; a' were as good crack a fusty nut with no kernel." "I pray you to serve Got, and keep you out of prawls and prabbles, and quarrels, and dissensions, and I warrant you it is the petter for you." "What's the matter, that you unlace your reputation thus, and spend your rich opinion, in howling abuse of your neighbors." What good? The chains of the oppressed are made stronger by it.

"The earth hath bubbles, as the water hath,
 And these are of them;
 On my life, my lord, a *bubble*."

Those who are abused by this kind of Abolitionists need never fear, or feel unpleasant about it. The best of men have been thus attacked by them. The philosopher has well said, "I should not think the man sound at heart against whom the world has not something to say; for some one always speaks ill against a good patriot, a lover of freedom, and an honorable man.

"Be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou
Shalt not escape calumny—
That thou art blamed, shall not be thy defect,
For slander's mark was ever yet the fair."

Zealous men are ever displaying to you the *strength* of their *belief*, their daggers, and non-resistance creeds, without practice to correspond, while judicious men are *showing* the *grounds* of it. "Wise men are instructed by reason; men of less understanding by experience; the most ignorant by necessity, and brutes by nature." To improve and christianise public sentiment is to enlarge it in thoughts, and good feeling, and purpose; and violence of all kinds degrades and demoralizes it. The following thoughts are full of truth.

"A GOOD NAME. Always be more solicitous to preserve your innocence than concerned to prove it. It will never do to seek a good name as a primary object. Like trying to be graceful, the effort to be popular will make you contemptible. Take care of your spirit and conduct, and your reputation will take care of itself. The utmost that you are called to do, as the guardian of your reputation, is to remove injurious aspersions. Let not your good be evil spoken of, and follow the highest examples in mild and explicit self-vindication. No reputation can be permanent which does not spring from principle; and he who would maintain a good character should be mainly solicitous to maintain a good character void of offence towards God and towards man."

One who feels this true of himself, need not manifest so much sensitiveness as Mr. Forman has, lest the community should not appreciate the vastness of his philanthropy, or that he should be "misunderstood" (his old story) in his abolition pretensions. The man of true merit need never offer loud-sounding words in self-defence of his cause. 'Tis the guilty one that gets angry, and fleeth when no man pursueth. Like your *pacifist* adviser, sir, you need

"Be advised;
Heat not a furnace for your foes so hot
That it do *singe yourself*: we may outrun,
By violent swiftness, that which we run at,
And lose by over-running. Know you not
The fire that mounts the liquor till 't run o'er,
In seeming to augment it, wastes it? Be advised."

Again. Surely, kind sir, never did mortal cook such a "kettle of fish," and call it parsonic, as you have printed to the world. Listen to a specimen of your "untrammelled" tongue, or pen:—"Untrue; garbled; scurrilous; falsified; dishonesty; fabricated; guerilla warfare; detraction; accusation; unalterably; not responsible even to the public for what I preach; grossest misrepresentations; object of Abolitionists "to reform and Christianize the public sentiment of the people;" denunciations of Abolitionists against the churches and clergy are too true; falsehood, Christian forbearance, and last but not least, I stand before them (my people) a free and untrammelled minister of the Christian religion." These are terms taken from Rev. J. G. Forman's vocabulary, the same in which he makes bold to assert the word liar "does not belong." Well may we exclaim with an emphasis, *astonishing, indeed, if true!* How very ministerial. An homily on forbearance, charity and humility, *would* be appropriate. Why not?

IV. Again. This untrammelled asserter has taken remarkably bold ground to trammel the public from thinking, or even speaking. One would think we were indeed Frenchmen. Listen to his declaration of sentiment, his Neapolitan *coup d'etat*. "It is *my* privilege to occupy *my* pulpit, and to preach *my* sentiments there without being molested in the right by any newspaper or its correspondents. *I am not responsible* to you, (editor) or even to the public, for what I preach, but only to God and my own people, in their collective capacity as a religious society." "What you say of the right and custom of newspaper criticism upon the discourses of a minister, delivered in his own church to a stated congregation, you are entirely mistaken about. As a question of right, I know that you have no such right or legal privilege whatever, either by yourself or your correspondents, and in the manner you have exercised it, *it will not be tolerated in future*. My *manuscript* discourses are private property, and you have no right to publish reports and extracts from, or strictures upon them. It makes no difference whether they are theological or ethical, or on questions of humanity. That is altogether an affair of *my own*, and of the society who employ my services."

Now is it possible for a public speaker to copy-right his extemporaneous remarks? "A Citizen" did not report anything else.

Then the whole of this declaration sounds like mere brag. 'Tis a fair specimen of brow-beating and bullying, not to say presumption and arrogance. There is no law to support it; and the threat that "it will not be tolerated in future," is without force, worthless, and becoming only to an inconsistent non-resistant. The endorser of such sentiments should add, "Ho! all ye unbelievers! *beware!* for I am an *Abolitionist*, and have a *dagger!*" But let us examine this untrammelled minister's declaration a little closer. "I am *not responsible* to you, or even to the public, for what I preach, but

only to God and my own people." Well then, let us suppose you preached treason towards the United States Government, or exhorted your hearers to resist, by force, paying their lawful taxes, denounced virtue and countenance vice. Have not the public any right to object, or any individual, not even of your own congregation, or an editor, to say what they think of such preaching? Astonishing doctrine this, truly; just fit for a ranter. S. S. Foster recommended the fugitive, when pursued, to resist, with a dagger, a law of the United States. You preached against this law, and your discourse was political in its bearing. He is a member of the Anti-Slavery Society for which you expressed much charity and sympathy. His zeal leads him to encourage the fugitive to become a *murderer*. You, in your pulpit, in your *extemporaneous* remarks, called this "a holy zeal." Your expression was, "I respect their *holy zeal*." Foster's *creed* discourages using carnal weapons. You say of certain articles which you have copied from the American Anti-Slavery Society's creed, (see *Mirror*, July 10th), "These are the sentiments which I endorsed in my sermon, and which I now subscribe and approve with all my heart." You and Foster & Co. are, by mutual consent, hand and glove together linked in one brotherly chain, to Abolitionism of this sort,—he recommending daggers, you, Non-resistant, talking of legal prosecutions, etc., trammeling people's mouths and the press with bullying threats. And now, Rev. sir, with what grace may we quote your own language to the editor, "O consistency, thou art a jewel!"

V. Rev. J. G. Forman said, in defence of the fanatical, abusive and scurrilous slang and vituperation of these Abolitionists, (see *Mirror*, July 10th), that "the reason the denunciations of the Abolitionists against the churches and clergy of the United States for their sanction and support of slave-holding, their fellowship with slave-holders, and their participation in the crime of slavery, has excited so much opposition and rancor in the bosom of the church, is because they are *too true*." He also said in his extemporaneous remarks, that the charge of infidelity brought against them "was not true." This is an additional specimen of his "untrammelled" assertions. By their words, and the testimony of some of their own members, let us judge, (provided, of course, he will permit us). Mr. Garrison said, in the Anti-Slavery Convention in Boston, May 25th, in speaking of the responsibility of the Society, "There are certain things for which such a body does become responsible; its votes, resolutions, etc., show what these are." From the Business Committee he reported a resolution on the Colonization Society, and a series of eight resolutions on the American Church and Clergy. These resolutions are in the *Liberator* of June 4th. They are too lengthy to copy, but there could not well be more slang, abuse, and vile vituperation, condensed into the same space. A few extracts are sufficient to show a specimen.

“Resolved, That the New England Anti-Slavery Convention” (in view of certain considerations) “would again record its testimony against the American Colonization Society and its auxiliaries, as animated by an unrelenting spirit of persecution,—as promulgating doctrines and sentiments equally detestable and unchristian, as Janus-faced in its professions and aims, as stimulating to fresh outrages upon the free people of color, as guarding and nourishing the entire system of slavery,” &c. All of which every one knows to be false.

The Colonization Society sent out 676 free blacks last year, and paid the expense, and this too, while the Abolitionists did little else but spend their funds slandering those who disagree with them.

The following are fair specimens of abuse as to the church and clergy; and the churches of Nantucket and other places must feel highly complimented, that Rev. J. G. Forman, who occasionally speaks of an exchange of pulpits, has identified himself as a fanatical Abolitionist, and says the reason such denunciations offend the clergy is because they are *“too true.”*

“Resolved, That it is still sacredly imposed upon us, by a scrupulous regard for the truth, by strict fidelity to the cause of the perishing slave, by all the aspirations and claims of oppressed humanity universally, to declare that the American Church is the mighty bulwark of American Slavery—the haughty, corrupt, implacable and impious foe of the anti-slavery movement, whether in its mildest or most radical aspect—the defender and sanctifier of colossal wrong and transcendent impiety—and consequently, that its pretensions to Christianity are the boldest effrontery and the vilest imposture.

“Resolved, That by the term ‘American Church,’ we do not mean every local association styling itself a church, but the overwhelming body of religious professors embraced in the Catholic, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, Unitarian, Universalist, and other denominations in all parts of the United States.

“Resolved, That, such being the character and position of that Church, it follows that the American Clergy are not less corrupt, degenerate and ungodly—‘blind leaders of the blind’—‘dumb dogs that cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber; yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand; they all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter’—‘A BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES,’ whose guilt is awfully enhanced by having ‘stolen the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil in.’”

After this may we not well inquire, where is Mr. Foster’s dagger, and Mr. Forman’s endorsement of Garrisonianism, and other things equally fanatical. Who does not know that the above resolutions are abusive and scurrilously false? Yet this same zealous endorser and non-resistant fighter swallows the doctrine that the Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, and

Friends Societies, in Nantucket and elsewhere, are only pretenders to Christianity, and among the vile impostors, their churches no better than brothels, and their pastors classed as "a brotherhood of thieves;" and now may we ask, is not such a man a false pretender to liberalism, charity and decency? Such philanthropy is so very drum-like, sounding loud because empty.

The zeal of the Rev. sir involves him in Woman's Rights, Ultra Peace principles, and "Non-resistance." Garrison hugs these and other phantoms as does this his coadjutor, only more so. In the "Writings of Garrison," recently published, may be found the following rare melange, showing plainly "*gratis anhelas, multa agendis nihil agens.*"*

"We register our testimony, not only against all wars, whether offensive or defensive, but all preparations for war; against every naval ship, every arsenal, every fortification; against the militia system and standing army; against all military chieftains and soldiers; against all monuments commemorative of victory over a foreign foe, all trophies won in battle, all celebrations in honor of military or naval exploits; against all *appropriations* for the *defense* of a *nation* by force and arms on the part of any legislative body; against every *edict* of *government* requiring of its subjects military service. Hence we deem it unlawful to bear arms, or to hold a military office."

After repudiating the government as it is, he says: "We therefore voluntarily exclude ourselves from every legislative and judicial body, and repudiate all *human politics*, worldly honors, *and stations of authority*. If we cannot occupy a seat in the Legislature or on the Bench, *neither can we elect others to act as our substitutes in any such capacity.*" "It follows that we cannot sue any man at law, to compel him by force to restore anything which he may have wrongfully taken from others." To show the consistency of this man's peace principles, and how they correspond with his mawkish non-resistance pretensions to Christian forbearance, he says: "There will be no real freedom or security among mankind until they beat their swords into plow-shares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and learn war no more. We grant that every successful struggle for freedom on the part of the oppressed, even with the *aid of cannon and bombshell*, *is to be hailed with rejoicing* but simply in reference to its object, and not to the mode of its accomplishment." This is endorsing Foster's daggerism in full. In the Liberator of July 23d, Garrison publishes a quotation purporting to be from Medico's remarks before the members of the Virginia Legislature and American Medical Association, assembled in Richmond last May. But as those remarks have never as yet been in print, he either quoted them from his own brain or that of the Rev. come-outers, and as the sentiments

* Out of breath to no purpose, and bring about nothing.

which he prints were not uttered by Medico, 'tis but reasonable to judge that the pates of these two brothers in fanaticism are a little addled. A screw is loose in one or both of them.

The following words from Garrison's book, page 117, are aptly applied to himself:—"They who, to promote the cause of truth will sanction the utterance of a falsehood, are to be put in the category of liars." In the Anti-Slavery Anniversaries, speaking of the influence of the Church upon the State, he said "the general assembly of the Presbyterian church (old school) was now holding its session in Sodom, Gomorrah, Pandemonium, the very focal point of slavery, Charleston, South Carolina. The new school assembly of this same church was held in Washington, a place where no one dared speak out his voice in favor of universal liberty. He also referred to the Methodist Conference in this city, as doing nothing for freedom, while they could be the guests of a slave-catching city government, and could go in a body to Faneuil Hall to hear the great slave-hunter of the country open his lips and blaspheme liberty." (Applause and hisses). *The press he complimented as being "ninety-nine out of one hundred interested in stifling the sentiment of liberty in this country."*

The following quotations from the same book (p. 119) relative to the "American Union," are a fair specimen of this pious judge's fanaticism of the government that protects himself and his property.

"Accursed be the American Union, as a stupendous republican imposture."—"Accursed be it, as a libel on democracy, and a bold assault on Christianity! Accursed be it, stained as it is with human blood, and supported by human sacrifices!"—"Accursed be it for its hypocrisy, its falsehood, its impudence, its lust, its cruelty, its oppression! *Accursed be it, as a mighty obstacle in the way of universal freedom and equality.*"—"Accursed be it from the foundation to the roof; and may there soon not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down."

We may soon expect to hear that this ring-leader of mad-caps is offering his execrations against the Insane Asylum, that out of charity keeps him within its kind protection. The above quotations show plainly the evil tendency of a man's dwelling too intensely upon one idea. Such usually, according to the natural laws of mind, become monomaniacs. Well may we say of their zeal,

"Although it had fifty hobbies to ride,
Has really no foundation;
But like the fabrics that gossips devise,—
Those single stories that often arise
And grow till they reach a four-story size,
— merely a faney creation."

VI. Again. Mr. Forman said the charge of infidelity brought against

the Anti-Slavery Society "was not true." But is not this, too, one of his assertions? Let us see what others say. A Mr. Barker, of whom Garrison speaks highly, says in the *Liberator* of June 14th, of the Bible—"It seems, therefore, evident to me, that so long as the Bible, or even that portion of the Bible which is called the New Testament, is regarded as *the word of God*, and as a *perfect rule* of life, great numbers will consider that slavery is not inconsistent with God's will, and that slave-holding is not inconsistent with piety, justice or charity. If I could believe the Bible, or even that portion of the Bible which is called the New Testament, to be the word of God, and a perfect rule of life, I should regard the Abolitionists as dangerous men, and regard abolitionism itself as infidel in its *character* and impious in its *tendency*. And I think it impossible to overthrow slavery in the United States without previously overthrowing the doctrine of the *divine authority* of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures." Wendell Phillips said (*Liberator*, June 4th) "he had listened with interest to the discussion during the day, on the question of infidelity. We said, years ago, that the only exodus for the slave from his house of bondage was over the *ruins* of the American *Church* and the American *Constitution*. We believed it then, and we believe it now." Mr. Barker and Wendell Phillips are men after Mr. Garrison's own heart. Mr. Forman finds in these men a congenial spirit, and "respects their holy zeal." Barker says if the Bible is the word of God, Abolitionists are "dangerous men," infidels, and their doctrine "impious in its tendency." Then out of their own mouths are these persons giving testimony of their infidelity.

H. C. Wright, formerly an anti-slavery lecturer, said in a recent number of the *Liberator*, in substance, that he had substituted Paine's "Age of Reason" for the Bible. Almost every number of that paper contains similar sentiments to the above quotations. The same paper has recently published both of Rev. J. G. Forman's effusions, from a Nantucket paper, and speaks highly of them. People are judged by the company they keep. "Birds of a feather," &c. And his combativeness and one-idea principle shows too plainly that

"He's the Salt River boatman, who always stands willing
To convey friend or foe without charging a shilling,
And so fond of the trips, that, when leisure's to spare
He'll row himself up, if he can't get a fare.
The worst of it is, that his logic's so strong,
That of two sides he commonly chooses the wrong;
If there is only one, why, he'll split it in two,
And first pummel this half, then that, black and blue.
That white's white needs no proof, but it takes a deep fellow
To prove it jet black, and that jet black is yellow."

It is but justice to remark here, that most of the community feel an

interest in the emancipation of the slave, while the Garrisonian fanatics, by their fool-hardiness, rashness and imprudence, are constantly throwing obstacles in the way of setting the colored people free. This is the opinion of the most eminent men in Boston and elsewhere, where Garrison is best known. It was the opinion of Dr. Channing, who did more for the cause than they ever have or ever will, and he had no fellowship with Garrisonians whatever. The Free Soil party have stood aloof from this squad of measly ranters, and they are abused constantly by the Liberator and by these itinerant blackguards, traveling about through the country, spunging a living out of those who are deceived by their slang.

There is an odor hanging about these ranters like that about Mormonism and Millerism. They are no friends to the slave, are enemies to freedom, to the truth, and are not worthy the confidence of honest and intelligent persons. Such is the opinion of all who know them well. Such is the testimony of many. In conversation recently with many prominent men in Richmond, Va., among others Gov. Johnston, and several members of the Legislature, they testified, that in their opinion slavery would have been done away with in Virginia long before this, had it not been for the rashness and imprudence of rabid Abolitionists. While in Washington, several prominent members of Congress,—among whom were those known as advocates for freedom,—expressed similar views.

Of the Sabbath, Garrison says: "The Sabbath, as now recognized and enforced, is one of the main pillars of priestcraft and superstition, and the strong-hold of a merely ceremonial religion." (See Garrison's Writings, p. 100). Mr. Webster says of the Anti-Slavery Society and its influence, "I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last twenty years have produced nothing good or valuable. I cannot but see what mischiefs their interference with the south has produced. The result of it has been, not to enlarge, but to restrain, not to free, but to bind faster the slave population of the south. That is my judgment." The Abolitionists, "mingling all the while their anathemas at what they call 'man-catching,' with the most horrid and profane abjurations of the Christian Sabbath, and indeed of the whole of Divine Revelation. They sanctify their philanthropy by irreligion and profanity; they manifest their charity by contempt of God and his commandments."

This is the opinion which the majority of New England people have of these pretenders to philanthropy. No one who has listened to them can doubt the truth of Mr. Webster's sentiments, expressed in the above quotations.

VII. The following are specimens of the "untrammelled" quibbler's contradicting himself and his quondam friend Garrison. Of his discourse he says: "What I said was, that I should discuss it (slavery) as a moral question, not as a question of politics; but that if its moral bearings led me

across the track of the politician, I should *go there*. So this "untrammeled" dodger did "go there" politically, electioneering for his own party. And most piteously does he whine, now that politicians "go there" too, and call him to an account for his hypocrisy. He thinks his pulpit and his apron-string philanthropy will protect him. Vain delusion.

Again. He says "so much of the definition of Abolitionism as makes its object the overthrow of the church, civil government, &c., are miserable falsehoods, invented by reporters of a corrupt press;" (meaning all except Garrisonian presses). Yet, when Phillips says the slave can be freed only by "the ruin of the American Church and the American Constitution," and Garrison says "accursed be the American Union," and "may there soon not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down," this same puerile "untrammeled" dodging quibbler says the reason the denunciations of Abolitionists against the church offends, &c., "is because it is too true." Well may he blush and hide himself with shame-facedness from such Garrisonian sedition and outrageous blasphemy against the American Union. Who would deny such men hemp, if their insanity and outraged consciences led them to leave the land of their birth for their country's good? Shakspeare says of Parolles, "that prince of braggarts, that valiant word-gun, that pronoun of a man, a marvelous compound of art, volubility, impudence, rascality and poltroonery," as a "bugbear of pretension and shadow in man's clothing;"—of Slender as a "most potent piece of imbecility, an indescribable and irresistible nihility, who is obliged to be *sue generis* from a lack of force of character to imitate or resemble anybody else." The following letter is from one of their own number formerly, who left them—soon as he found them out.

The author of this letter has been for some years President of the Oberlin College, Cleveland, Ohio, and is a man of eminence, of influence, candor and Christian standing, for aught that I have ever heard. The Anti-Slavery Convention poured out much of their wrath upon him last May, as they did also upon Mr. Webster, Drs. Dewey, Gannett and Spring, Father Mathew, R. W. Emerson, Kossuth, the Whig, Democratic and Free Soil parties, and as they do upon everybody who differ from them. No libel is so great as to have evil men's praise. Those err who so act as to please evil-minded persons. The Liberator praises Rev. J. G. Forman. Should it praise "Medico," he will ask what ill he's done that blackguards approve? Should it speak ill, it is just what may be expected from such unprincipled knaves and infidels.

President Mahan, of Oberlin College, for years an active member of the Anti-Slavery Society, gives an opinion which is worthy of a careful perusal.

From the Glasgow Examiner.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT MAHAN.

"REV. WM. SCOTT,

"DEAR BROTHER:—From communications which I received some months since, I perceive that a difference of opinion has arisen among the friends of the slave and the advocates of human rights, in Glasgow, in regard to the character and influence of the American Anti-Slavery Society. In these communications my own name is referred to, and different and opposite constructions are put by yourself and others upon statements which I made when in your city some two years since. To yourself and others I made the statement, that while the society speaks one word for the slave, it speaks two against the church. You understood me to mean by the term church, a pro-slavery church; others understood me to use the term without any such intended qualification. In this they were right, and you wholly misunderstood my meaning. I used no such qualifying term, as you will no doubt recollect, nor did I suppose myself to convey the meaning which its use would imply. As the subject is up, and in accordance with the advice and solicitation of Christian friends, I will present you with a full and frank statement of my opinion of the American Anti-Slavery Society, the society of which W. L. Garrison is the prominent leader and representative. I will also state some of my reasons for that opinion. I believe, then, I give not only my own but the almost, if not quite, undivided opinion of Christian men of this country, when I say that this society, in its fundamental tendencies and aims, is not, properly speaking, an Anti-Slavery Society, but an infidel, no-human government movement, using the anti-slavery sentiment as a club with which to strike down the church and the state, and mainly the former. I do not, nor do Christian anti-slavery men, object to the society because infidels are members, and are employed as lecturers by it. I am willing to join with infidels, Mahomedans, and Hindoos even, in vindicating the rights of crushed humanity. But I am not willing to lend my countenance for a moment to a society which, masking itself as an anti-slavery society, is in fact aiming to prostrate Christianity itself. I know you too well to entertain a doubt in respect to the fact of a perfect harmony of views with regard to the sentiment above expressed. But what is the character of the American Anti-Slavery Society? Look, in the first place, at the *Liberator*, the exponent of the principles of the president of that society. I do not say that it never contains articles advocating the claims of Christianity as of divine origin, but I have never heard of such an article contained in it. On the other hand, this paper is one of the principal mediums through which formal assaults are made upon the claims of the Bible and our religion to such an origin, a main sewer through which the most grossly infidel sentiments are being conveyed into the public mind. The vantage ground which it occupies as an advocate of human rights is thus used to open batteries upon Christianity itself. *As far as my observation and information extend, the progress of this society is in fact an enlargement of the dead sea of infidelity.* Professing Christians even, who are drawn into fellowship with it, are almost, if not quite universally, drawn into opposition not merely to a pro-slavery church, but to the church as such, with all its ordinances, and to Christianity itself.

"We may also form some estimate of the character and tendencies of this society from the known character of its agents and lecturers. I know of but three gentlemen whose entire time is, and for many years has been, wholly devoted to the interests of the

society as public agents and lecturers, to wit, H. C. Wright, Parker Pillsbury and S. S. Foster. All these are open apostates from Christianity, having all of them once been preachers, or candidates for the ministry. Like all apostates, they hate with a hatred unmingled and most bitter the faith they have rejected. What should we expect would be the influence of a society, represented by and reaching the public through such men? What should we suppose would be the ultimate and chief aims of such men, hating as they do Christianity and the church far more than they do slavery? It is to my mind fearfully ominous in respect to the tendency and aims of a society whose file leaders are such men. But what is the character of the teachings and influence of these men as a matter of fact? Everywhere they appear as the most bitter denunciators of the church as the pillar of slavery and the mother of abominations, and these denunciations are poured out without any careful and just discrimination. To them the church has but one neck, and they aim at least to cut off its head with a single blow. "We are coming into Ohio," said one of them in a letter to a friend of mine, "for the purpose of putting down the church and the government; will you join us?" "Will your mission end," said this same friend to another of them, "with slavery abolished, and all things put right in respect to it?" "No," was the reply, "our mission does not end till we have put down the church." To show how utterly indiscriminating they are in denouncing churches, take a single example:—Seventeen years ago or more, the church at Oberlin withdrew from all connection with pro-slavery organizations, openly withheld communion and fellowship with slave-holders, repudiated the negro pew, and all other known pro-slavery principles and usages. It would seem that such a position would save this church from even the sweeping denunciations of these men, yet there probably is no church in the land that receives their unqualified denunciation more frequently, or so bitterly, as this very church. One of them told me that, in his judgment, there was no church in the United States that was doing so much to uphold slavery as the church in Oberlin. In a great meeting of days, held a few miles from us, in a great tent purchased for the purpose, much of the time of these men was spent in holding up this church to public reprobation; and one of the prominent reasons avowed was that we believed in the inspiration of the Old Testament, and worshipped the God revealed therein, the God, as they call him, of incest, murder and blood. In short, the offence of Oberlin was this:—we were a church, and not "come-outers," uniting with it H. C. Wright, Parker Pillsbury and S. S. Foster against Christianity itself. These men, the approved agents of this society, sent out for one professed purpose exclusively, are yet using their anti-slavery platform as a battery with which to assault the Bible and the character of a church, for no other reason than that it was a church, and its members Christians.

"Everywhere also they are accustomed to speak of the church in such a manner as to bring the church as such, the ministry, and all the ordinances, into contempt, and I see not how any person can listen to them without being impressed with the conviction that it is with them a fixed purpose and aim to produce that result. Take an example or two in illustration: One of them boasted to me that they had brought about such a public sentiment in Massachusetts as to render it impossible for the churches there to have revivals. Another, in a public lecture, hypothesised a company of dogs as coming forward to join the church, catechised them, imagined as present, in respect to their doctrinal knowledge and experience, and then went over the ordinance of baptism, exclaiming, "I baptise thee, Bose, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen," and so with the others. It got into the papers that dogs were actually brought upon the stage. This the *Liberator* pronounced "a Satanic lie," but did not deny the fact as above stated. What shall we think of a society which employs men, knowing them to be guilty of such blasphemous outrages upon all that is sacred in religion and the religious sentiment in man?

"This the American Anti-Slavery Society does. In a meeting of this society in the city of Rochester, New York, where the chairman, at the commencement of one of the sessions, simply remarked that if any present desired to offer prayer, an opportunity would be given. Mr. Garrison instantly rose and ridiculed the idea of having prayer at all, and spoke with approbation of a lady, who asked his father why he did not ask a blessing upon a whole barrel of pork at a time, and have the matter finished at once, instead of going through the ceremony every time a portion of it was brought upon the table. It is thus that the church, as such, with the ministry and all the ordinance, are treated by this society. Now when I see men upholding for years a system of operations which manifestly tends to but one result, I do not hesitate to impute to them the design to produce that result. For this reason I am compelled to regard this society, not as to what it professes to be, an anti-slavery society and nothing else, but as being, in its fundamental tendencies and aims, an anti-church and anti-Christian society. This is the light, I repeat, in which Christian anti-slavery men throughout the length and breadth of the land do regard it, and are they not justified in so doing?

"I have one other remark to make of this society, and then I have done. The main element in the spirit of the movement, it honestly appears to me, is revilism, the principle of hatred to slavery, to slave-holders and their abettors, to the church and to the state, and love to nobody. I see almost nothing in their writings or lectures which tends to excite in the mind the spirit of universal philanthropy. I have no sympathy with the spirit of the society, and do not wish to have any. I lay down their writings and leave their meeting with feelings of horror, such as I conceive myself to possess were I fleeing from some cold dark cavern, haunted by spirits of darkness. I see no tendency in this society tending towards the real spirit of universal love, or any of its fruits. I have spoken free to you, my brother, of my views of this society. You will appreciate my motive, and no doubt give to my statements a candid hearing.

"Yours, with much esteem,

"A. MAHAN.

"Cleveland, Ohio, December, 1851."

VIII. This then is the society which the Rev. "come-outer" sympathizes with, and speaks of with charity and feeling, and thinks is "Christianizing public sentiment" of the people. And now may we not ask, about how long it will take to convince *others* that their's is a "holy zeal," and that the community are to be benefitted by throwing aside the Bible, placing themselves under the instruction of such teachers, who abuse all who disagree with them, after the manner of these fanatics? How many daggers does S. S. Foster think the fugitives will have to use, to accomplish their purpose? Is there not as much guilt resting upon those who recommend the fugitive to become murderer, as upon the one who *uses* the dagger? Does not the law recognize those who become accessories to crime as criminals? Is not resistance to established laws of the land a crime, and can clergymen preach resistance to law from their pulpits, and then be so stupidly foolish as to think themselves protected by the sanctity of their pulpits? Do they not rather make a sacrilegious use of their privileges by so doing? It would seem so. True he may preach what he pleases, and it's equally as true, his hearers will think what they please

about it, and it's not impossible they may speak their own thoughts, too. It would be a little Popish for them, *a la* come-outers, to fling aside *trammels* from their *own* tongues and clinch them upon their neighbors. No, sir, that will never do. Verbum sapienti. Some ten years a resident in Boston, mingling with men of various callings and professions, it is but justice to say, that few indeed can be found who differ from the sentiments expressed by President Mahan. No one can spend an hour in the anti-slavery meetings, as they have been conducted in Boston, without having abundance of evidence that all he says of their infidelity, disloyalty to the government and pernicious influence of the Liberator, is true. Every word of it is true. So thinks one who has listened to them often for years past. Well has it been said of such fanatics and their abusive language, "All the 'decent drapery' of decorum they throw off with the utmost carelessness." They are justly classed among the one-idea fry, egotistic snivelers and ranters after notoriety; enemies to the emancipation of the slave from his bondage, retarding the progress of the dawn of freedom by their injudicious course, back-biters, public brawlers, disunionists, slanderers and revilers. They mistake their mental diseases for philanthropy. They would re-construct society after the image of their own sick imaginations, and make slaves alike of whites and blacks. An humane imbecility, "like the mingling of moonbeams with fog, drearily illumines the intense inane of their rhetoric." "Their idiosyncracies, follies, maladies, moonshine and misery" are never better satisfied than when feeding upon the entrails, garbage, filth and scum of frailty. To them there is no sunny side of life, but all is gloomy, dark, yea, black as the blackest specimen of the "image of God cut in ebony." When we consider the welfare of society, the progress of civilization, the moral elevation of the race, and contemplate the enfeebling, if not immoral result of indulging in a dainty and debilitating egotism, we cannot but look upon the influence of these sniveling whimperers as degrading and pernicious. Even their selfish lamentation, though accompanied by talent, should be treated with the contempt and scorn it deserves. There are so many inducements to pamper these unspiritual "manifestations" in this age, that there can be but little danger that opposition will be too severe; neither is it a duty to let it pass in silence. Said Mr. Garrison in Nantucket a few years since, "These people are too much united; we can get no foothold here for our principles till we stir up strife and get them quarreling among themselves." They abused all, and were pelted with rotten eggs, driven from one public hall to another, and finally off the island. Theirs is the spirit of strife and hatred, yes, bitter hatred to all who disagree with them. They forget that, like charity, "mercy" never faileth. "If we do good, says another, "to them who hate us, we are doubly happy, and they have no power to hurt us."

But how accursed is the spirit of hatred! the deadliest spirit and the

worst which the poet places in his pandemonium of evil. Gloomily she came upon the world, as smoke from the bottomless pit, shrouding the sun of heaven, and withering the beauty of earth. Onward she has trod her fearful way, the dark minister of terror. Her throat is an open sepulchre; with her tongue she uses deceit; the poison of asps is under her lips; her mouth is full of cursing and bitterness," (such as comes from the pen of this Rev. sir). "Hers it is to sow discord among brethren; hers to scatter party spirit and bigotry over the land; hers to make children of the same soil Cains to one another (with daggers); hers to dash nation against nation, and to bury millions in the shock; hers to rejoice in evil as her good, and to glory when evil is triumphant; when domestic peace has fled the earth; when tranquility is banished from the neighborhood; when the avenger *plunges the death-aceapon* in his opponent's bosom; when the incendiary purples the midnight with a sanguinary blaze; when the plain is reeking and the city heaves in agony, and thrones tremble in the crash,—"*hatred is there; there is ruthless fury;*" and Garrisonians are striving to ruin our government, discard Holy Writ, stir up strife between the north and south, and in cities and villages, and among friends, wherever they go. Mobs usually accompany them. And in conclusion, well may we say to the author of these two communications, so full of anger and bitterness,— "One may pretend to quiet in the sight of men; he may justify himself with ingenious arguments and with many words; but the irritation of his soul consumes him. In the sight of God and man, in the secret conviction of the soul, the *forgiver* has the award of righteousness, and he has the position of greatness. Is not the implacable spirit generally connected with some other unholy passion, love of popularity, for instance? One dark thought cherished in the mind has an evil fecundity of others darker than itself. But the mind that turns from the evil to seek the good will ever find sufficient to recompense its labor and to mitigate its severity. Is not the spirit of Christian forgiveness and forbearance becoming a preacher, Rev. sir? Is it not becoming to "preserve the simplicity of charity, rather than to nourish the prejudice of aversion?" Is it not better to strive at least "to discern in the vague obscurity, floating images of good, than to magnify, by the mist of anger, every fault into gigantic stature? If we conceive the unutterable light of a genial and benignant temper, we must regard a vindictive disposition as a sad affliction, and we must pity the man who feeds the serpent which stings himself. "We are liable to mistakes respecting others, even in their external life; we can but dimly see it; we behold it in remote perspective, and hear of it with uncertain sound." To err is human. None are infallible. It has been said that Christian forgiveness can rise to positive good towards an enemy. A man under its influence would do justice to his enemy's merits; he would admit his virtues; make allowance for his weakness; defend his character; sympathize

with his affliction, desire his happiness, and if possible, aid him to attain it. (Is this true, Rev. sir?) "He would thus try to make impression by the silent eloquence of elevated principle; he would prove by his entire conduct how superior charity is to pride and hatred; he would embrace every opportunity to remove misapprehension; and finally, he would fall upon the heart of his opponent with gentle droppings of kindness." Time will prove what you and others have not yet fully understood. You have made a sad mistake. There is truth in the spirit of charity;

" It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
 Upon the place beneath; it is twice blessed;
 It blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

• *Boston, August, 1852.*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 002 199 076 0